

REMARKS

The amendment of claim 11 is supported by the disclosure in paragraph [0035] (last three lines) of the specification.

Claims 11 and 15 have been rejected as being anticipated by Nakakawaji. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Embodiment 3 of Nakakawaji for making the anticipation rejection. Embodiment 3 teaches applying a first lubricant on the disk and a second lubricant on the layer of the first lubricant such that the second lubricant “is readily absorbed by the first layer and the surface of the magnetic disk.” See column 14, lines 62-63. Thus, Embodiment 3 of Nakakawaji teaches a first layer bonded to the disk, wherein the first layer has both the first and second lubricant and, maybe, a second layer on the first layer with just the second lubricant. Nakakawaji does not disclose that the second layer contains an additive and a lubricant. On the other hand, claim 11 recites “A recording media comprising a base layer, the base layer being a carbon overcoat, an additive layer comprising an additive bonded to the base layer and a lubricant film comprising a lubricant and the additive, *in this order*.” Thus, claim 11 is distinguished from Embodiment 3 of Nakakawaji.

Claims 11, 13-19 were rejected as being obvious over Ng in view of Yanagisawa and Falcone. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner states that “Ng teaches that the ‘another lubricant’ that may overcoat the amphiphilic compound [of Ng] may be a compatible fluorocarbon oil. The examiner broadly interprets this as *excluding* fluorocarbon oils that would be phase separated from the amphiphilic compound.” [Bold and underlining in original; italics added.] Thus, by the Examiner’s own interpretation, Ng’s amphiphilic compound and fluorocarbon oil are compatible and not phase separated. On the other hand, claim 11 clearly recites that the additive and the lubricant are phase separated in a mixture containing the additive

and the lubricant wherein the additive in the mixture is not bonded to the base layer. What was totally unexpected of this invention was that even though the additive and the lubricant are phase separated in a mixture containing the additive and the lubricant, the additive and the lubricant do *not* phase separate on a carbon overcoat base layer of the recording media.

Yanagisawa and Falcone also fails fill to disclose "wherein on the recording media the additive is not phase separated from the lubricant even though the additive and the lubricant otherwise phase separate in a mixture containing the additive and the lubricant wherein the additive in the mixture is not bonded to the base layer." In short, the prior fails to disclose this limitation *as a whole*.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this request and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that a fee is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **146712004700**.

Dated: August 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Raj S. Dave
Registration No. 42,465

Morrison & Foerster LLP
2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1888
TELEPHONE: (202) 887-1500
FACSIMILE: (202) 887-0763